

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action dated September 21, 2006 (Office Action). This response is filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, and as such, no fees are believed to be due. The Examiner is expressly authorized, however, to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 12, 22, 24, 26-29, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2001/0042083 to Saito, *et al.* (hereinafter Saito), in view of U.S. Patent 6,073,148 to Rowe (hereinafter Rowe). Claims 13-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of U.S. Patent 5,911,776 to Guck (hereinafter Guck). Claims 3, 5, 10, 11, 23, 25, 30, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito, in view of Rowe, and further in view of Guck.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 13, 14, 22, and 33 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. The claim amendments, as discussed herein, are fully supported throughout the Specification. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 13, line 16 – p. 14, line 3; p. 14, lines 14-19; p. 16, line 19 – p. 17, line 13; p. 17, lines 4-13; and p. 19, line 21 – p. 20, line 10.) No new matter has been introduced by the amendments.

Aspects Of The Invention

Prior to addressing the cited references, it may be useful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention. One embodiment of the invention, exemplified by Claim 1, as amended, is a method for converting formatted content in order to repurpose the content.

The method can include receiving from a client a content request specifying a network location from which a specified document, including formatted content, can be retrieved. The content request can also indicate a target format, according to the method.

Further according to the method, a template corresponding to the specified document and the target format can be identified in response to the request.

The identification tag, according to the method, can be based on a template identifier corresponding to a network location identifier of the specified network location. The template can provide one or more content markers. Each content marker can indicate a data offset for identifying within the specified document one or more data fields containing information corresponding to a predetermined topic. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 14, lines 14-19, and p. 17, lines 4-13.) Moreover, each content marker can further indicate at least a topic, meaning, and/or purpose of the information content contained in each particular data field. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 13, line 16 – p. 14, line 3; p. 14, lines 19-22; p. 16, line 19 – p. 17, line 13; and p. 19, line 21 – p. 20, line 10.)

According to the method, the template can be customized by a user to extract in one or more different combinations from the specified document information based upon the one or more content markers. The method also can include retrieving the specified document from the specified network location. Additionally the method can include applying the template to the specified document and extracting data from the formatted content based upon the template. The method further can include formatting the data based upon the template to provide a second document formatted according to the target format.

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

As noted above, independent Claims 1 and 22 were both rejected as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Rowe. Saito is directed to a document processing system and method that each include generating a search template for retrieving information from documents. (See, e.g., paragraphs [0006]-[0009]; see also Abstract.) Rowe is directed to a method and apparatus for optimizing a page-based electronic

document and for downloading and displaying at least a portion of the page-based document without "excessive time delays." (Col. 3, lines 44-47.)

Rowe is cited at page 3 of the Office Action as disclosing a marker that identifies an offset for determining content location within a document. Saito is cited as disclosing each of the other features recited.

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that neither Saito nor Rowe, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests each feature recited in amended Claims 1 and 22. For example, the references do not teach or suggest a template that provides one or more content markers having each of the attributes provided with Applicants invention. Specifically, neither of the references teach or suggest using a content marker that indicates both a data offset as well as a topic, meaning, and/or purpose of the information contained in a particular data field and pertaining to a predetermined topic.

In portions cited in the Office Action, Saito describes a search template that "includes a user-defined element name, their corresponding coordinates, indentation, font size, font type, as well as number of lines." (Paragraph [0050].) These attributes pertain only to location and presentation formats of data. Saito's template does not provide a content marker that indicates the topic, meaning, or purpose of particular information contained in distinct data fields, as indicated by the content markers provided by Applicants' invention.

That Saito's search template does not provide a content marker that indicates any of these attributes is shown in other portions of the reference cited in the Office Action:

"[A] plurality of the search plates is generated for various types of documents, and steps are illustrated for another preferred process of extracting information from an unknown document image according to the current invention. In a step 301, an unknown document is inputted, and the

inputted document image is divided into areas in a step 302. Predetermined layout characteristic information is extracted in a step 303. It is determined whether or not there is a logic model to which the current input document data has not been compared in a step 304. If there is an unprocessed logic model, in a step 305, the current document data is processed according to the logic model. Areas are extracted according to the logic model in a step 306 while sentence areas are extracted according to the logic model in a step 307. The sentence areas are determined to increase accuracy by possibly correcting wrongly divided areas." (Paragraph [0050], lines 1-18.) (Emphasis supplied.)

The quoted language explicitly demonstrates that Saito's template extracts information strictly based upon "layout characteristics." This, however, has nothing to do with the nature of the extracted information itself.

That Saito's extraction of information is based strictly on layout characteristics, not the nature or content of data itself, is demonstrated in other portions of the reference cited in the Office Action:

"[A] preferred process of determining a total reliability index in generating a search template according to the current invention are illustrated in a flow chart. In a step 501, a counter "i" is initialized to zero and is compared to a predetermined layout characteristic value in a step 502. If the counter value is smaller than the predetermined layout characteristic value, a similarity value is determined based upon a logic model in a step 503. The similarity value is multiplied by a weight coefficient in a step 505. The weight coefficient allows to modify similarity based upon the reliability of the

layout characteristics. The product is added to the total reliability index score. After the step 505, the counter is incremented by one in a step 506, and the steps 502 through 506 are repeated. On the other hand, if the counter exceeds the predetermined layout characteristic value in the step 502, the total reliability index score is outputted." (Paragraph [0052].) (Emphasis supplied.)

"[T]he above described weight concept for layout characteristics is further illustrated in a diagram. Sample documents I through 3 of a substantially similar type are inputted one at a time during the search template learning or fine tuning process. The layout characteristics such as indent, font size and font type are initially set as 1.00" for initial weight or value parameter values. Based upon the reliability of each layout characteristics, for example, indent is considered more reliable than font type. That is, the indent information among the sample documents is more consistently available. Thus, the indent characteristic now has a larger reliability index of "3.30" while the font type characteristics now has a smaller reliability index of "0.60." (Paragraph [0053].)

Even in that portion of Saito that describes the search for information using a key text extraction technique, the search is based upon formatting considerations, namely, "layout information":

"All of the components of the second alternative embodiment except for the key text related elements are substantially identical to those of a preferred embodiment as shown in FIG. 5. The key text elements include a key text

storing unit 701, a key text database 702 and a search engine 705. In order to efficiently search the information, a key text extraction unit 700 extracts a predetermined set of key text or key words in optically character recognized data. The key text includes a summary, an abstract, a chapter title, a header, a footer. The key text also includes a legend, a figure number, and a text portion associated with the figures. In certain circumstances, the key text extraction unit 700 extracts the above described key text information based upon layout information." (Paragraph [0050], lines 4-19.) (Emphasis supplied.)

As explicitly described, Saito's technique is focused exclusively on layout characteristics, not the nature of the information contained in an electronic document. In particular, Saito fails to teach or suggest any mechanism for taking into account a topic, purpose, or meaning of the information. Indeed, Saito does not even suggest a template that provides one or more content markers that indicate a topic, meaning, or purpose of information content contained in particular data fields, as recited in each of the amended independent claims.

Moreover, Saito does not teach or suggest a content marker that indicates a data offset for identifying within a specified document one or more data fields containing information corresponding to a predetermined topic. As the language quoted above demonstrates, Saito's template is focused exclusively on "layout characteristics." Saito does not contemplate identifying or extracting data content corresponding to a specific topic. Accordingly, Saito does not provide any mechanism for identifying data fields that contain information pertaining to a particular topic. Specifically, Saito does not identify data fields containing data content corresponding to a particular topic, as recited in each of the amended independent claims. Nor does Saito provide a content marker that indicates a

topic, purpose, or meaning of the data content, as further recited in each of the amended independent claims.

As described in the Specification, Applicants' invention provides a mechanism for repurposing data content contained in electronic documents. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 13, line 19 – p. 14, line 3.) For example, Applicants' invention provides a mechanism to obtain isolated data from one or more documents and, using a content marker, indicate that the data is a sports score, temperature for a particular city, or a specific stock quote so that the data can be presented to a user such. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 12, lines 2-14; p. 20, lines 3-10; p. 23, lines 12-22; and p. 24, lines 15-20.) Applicants invention thus provides a mechanism whereby otherwise isolated data can be identified and extracted so that it can be presented to a user in a form that gives the data meaning or purpose specific to a predetermined topic. Saito does not provide a template that can accomplish this aspect of the invention.

Amended independent Claims 13, 14, and 33 were rejected as unpatentable over different combinations of references, but Saito is cited with respect to each as teaching a template having at least one content marker. (See, Office Action, pp. 4-6 and 8.) As already explained, however, Saito fails to teach or suggest a template that provides a content marker having the attributes recited in each of the amended independent claims.

Accordingly, the references fail to teach or suggest every feature recited in amended independent Claims 1, 13, 14, 22, and 33. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that each of Claims 1, 13, 14, 22, and 33 defines over the prior art. Applicants further respectfully submit that whereas each of the remaining claims depends from one of the amended independent claims while reciting additional features, these dependent claims likewise define over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **December 20, 2006**



Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577

Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Customer No. 40987

Post Office Box 3188

West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

Telephone: (561) 653-5000